DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 250 812 EA 017 320

AUTHOR Rutherford, William L.; And Others
TITLE A New Perspective on the Work of Managers.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
REPORT NO R&DCTE-R-3180
PUB DATE Dec 83
NOTE 44p.; For related documents, see EA 017 309-311 and EA 017 321-324.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Characteristics; Curriculum Development; Elementary Secondary Education; Leadership Qualities; *Leadership Styles; *Principals; Problem Solving; *School Supervision; *Supervisory Methods
IDENTIFIERS Mintzberg (Henry)

ABSTRACT

The purposes of the research reported in this paper are, first, to study the actions taken by school principals to facilitate a curriculum change in their schools and, second, to determine the relationship between those actions, the leadership style of the principal, and the extant situational variables. Data were collected by means of bimonthly structured interviews with nine elementary school principals, selected on the basis of leadership style--four responders, three managers, and two initiators. A variety of other research tools were used to cross-validate and enrich the interview technique, including interviews with subordinates working under the principals. The findings present relationships that were found between the style of the principals and the following work behavior variables (after Mintzberg): brevity, variety, fragmentation, medium, flow, and location. Thereafter, nine propositions about situational influences are discussed. In the summary, four key conclusions are drawn: (1) previously identified characteristics of manager working behavior have been confirmed, but behaviors are clearly influenced by style; (2) style has greater influence on manager behavior than situational variables; (3) it is possible to identify distinct manager styles; and (4) style is very stable, despite varying behaviors. Four pages of references are included. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

O. H. Bown

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED250812

A NEW PERSPECTIVE ON THE WORK OF MANAGERS

William L. Rutherford
Gene E. Hall
Shirley M. Hord

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas At Austin

EA 017 320

R+D Report 3180

Submitted to Administrative Science Quarterly
December, 1983

A NEW PERSPECTIVE ON THE WORK OF MANAGERS

William L. Rutherford
Gene E. Hall
Shirley M. Hord

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

INTRODUCTION

During the decade that has elapsed since the publication of Mintzberg's (1973) seminal study on manager work behavior, many other researchers have conducted similar studies (Sproull, 1981; Willis, 1980; Martin and Willower, 1981; Duignan, 1980, Thomas, Willis and Phillips, 1981; and Kmetz and Willower, 1982.) These studies are similar in that their primary objective was to describe the nature of manager work behavior and a second purpose was to consider the variables that influence that behavior. They are also similar in that they all used the research technique of structured observation as the principal means of data collection.

The study reported in this paper shares the same purposes as the above studies, to investigate the work behavior of a group of managers and to study the key variables that might influence the behavior of the managers. However, this study differs in its methodology. Rather than structured observation, bimonthly structured interviews were used as the primary means for collecting data. A variety of other research tools, which will be described in a subsequent section, were used to cross validate and enrich the interview technique. Another difference between this study and those cited above is that subordinates working under the managers who were being studied were also

included as subjects in the study. In addition to reporting findings from this new study, this report will show how studies that pursue the similar purpose, understanding manager work behavior, through the use of very different methodologies compare in their findings.

THE NATURE OF MANAGER WORK

Perhaps Mintzberg's study is best known for its characterizations of manager work. He found that the activities of managers"...are characterized by brevity, variety and fragmentation" (p. 51). Mintzberg asserts that there is a lack of pattern among activities and the "...trivial is interspersed with the consequential..." and that "Superficiality is an occupational hazard of the manager's job" (p. 51). In recent years, several investigations of school leaders patterned after Mintzberg's work have described the activities of these managers in terms even more graphic than Mintzberg's. They have described the work of the school manager as "frenzied" (Gronn, 1983); "choppy, short-range and casual" (Sproull, 1981); and "hectic and disjointed" (Willis, 1980). From studies of Australian school administrators Thomas, Willis and Phillips (1981) concluded that the position of school principal "appears to be characterized by a high level of superficiality in performance, uncertainty, short time perspective, interruption and lack of adequate feedback on performance. Although elsewhere the word 'locust' may be more readily understood, in Australia 'grasshopper administration' would appear an apt description of at least some principals, as they are virtually compelled to hop from one place to another and all in rapid succession" (p. 69).

In addition to looking at the behaviors of managers, the various studies of manager work have investigated the roles and importance of the manager. From his study, Mintzberg (1973) concludes: "The manager takes full charge of

his organization's strategy-making system. To use other words, the manager is substantially involved in every significant decision made by his organization. This is so because (1) as formal authority the manager is the only one allowed to commit his organization to new and important courses of action, (2) as nerve center the manager can best ensure that significant decisions reflect current knowledge and organizational values, and (3) strategic decisions can most easily be integrated by having one man control all of them" (p. 77).

Generally confirming of Mintzberg's conclusions are those of Martin and Willower (1981) drawn from their study of five high school principals. They found that although superordinates (e.g. superintendent), and subordinates (teachers) share in control of the school with the principal, the principals were in command of the situations with which they were involved. In fact, they seemed to have greater command over their role performance than did Mintzberg's managers. They exercised authority over organizational maintenance, administration of the instructional program, pupil control and extra-curricular activities.

Based on his study of five managers of major educational innovation who were judged to be successful in their jobs Sproull (1981) concluded, "The manager who can keep people happy, supplied with resources, and not inquire too closely into their activities is doing a good job. In an ambiguous world, comfort and solidarity are derived from social pleasantries. Pride comes from extracting tangible resources from a larger bureaucracy or from protecting a program from bureaucratic encroachment. And a social belief in progress comes from the existence of a 'major innovation' and a 'manager'" (p.121).

While Mintzberg and Martin and Willower perceive that managers make an important contribution to the organization, the Thomas et al and Sproull studies seem to minimize the importance of the manager. The variance of

findings among these many studies on the nature of manager behavior and their role in the organization raises the question "What is the accurate characterization of a manager?" Is it the frenzied individual hopping about at a hectic pace performing his duties in a casual, choppy, short range manner with little impact on the organization? Or is it the individual whose activities are a mixture of the trivial and consequential and are marked by brevity and variety but collectively are critical to the well-being of the organization? As might be expected, these studies of manager work behavior have attempted to identify variables that influence that behavior.

VARIABLES INFLUENCING MANAGER WORK

The two sets of variables that emerge from the studies that seem to have the greatest probability for influencing the behavior, roles and work of managers are situational variables and style. Martin and Willower (1981) found that the task performance patterns of their five principals were almost identical with little difference in time allocation for the various activities, and they believed this similarity to be more the result of similar situations rather than the "...adoption of a widely accepted work technology" (p. 82). They also state "...the task performance of principals was also modified to meet the needs of operational constraints or personal style" (p. 82). Martin and Willower obviously believe in the influence of situation and style.

From his own study and from the findings of other researchers, Mintzberg (1973) accepts as fact that there will be variations in the way managers work. He establishes the proposition that, "Variations in the content and characteristics of managers' work can be explained by a contingency theory

comprising four sets of variables--environmental variables, including characteristics of the milieu, the industry, and the organization; job variables, including the level in the organization and the function supervised; person variables, including the personality and style of the incumbent; and situational variables, including a host of time-related factors" (pp. 129-130). In the study reported in this paper, the environmental, job and situational variables are all considered to be situational variables.

Regarding style, Mintzberg stated "We may be able to learn much of interest by studying the effect that the personality and style of the incumbent have on work performed. Unfortunately, little evidence has been produced so far!" (p. 119). This research study addresses this need in a direct manner looks also at the influence of situational variables.

NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The major purposes of the research reported in this paper were, first, to study the actions taken by school principals to facilitate a curriculum change in their schools and second, to determine the relationship between those actions and the change facilitator style of the principal and the extant situational variables. To accomplish this, nine elementary school principals were studied for an entire school year. Three principals were chosen in each of three separate school districts where district-wide curriculum innovations were being implemented. The districts were chosen to represent first, second and third year implementation efforts.

Principals within the districts were selected on two criteria. First, they had to be judged by superordinates to be performing satisfactorily in their position. Second, they were selected on the basis of leadership style.

Superordinates within each district who knew the principals were given a description of three patterns of principal behaviors, or styles, prepared by the researchers and asked to identify principals that fit each pattern. Researchers contacted the principals, explained the study and asked them to participate. The first nine principals contacted agreed to participate.

Principal Styles.

In studies conducted previous to this one, the researchers had determined that how curriculum changes were implemented in schools was influenced by the actions of the principal (Melle and Pratt, 1981; Hord, 1981). Careful consideration of the change facilitator behavior of the principals in these studies led to the preliminary identification of three behavioral patterns (i.e. change facilitator styles) that eventually came to be termed Manager, Responder and Initiator styles (Hall, Hord & Griffin 1980; Rutherford, 1981).

Descriptions of these styles were used for principal selection and the actual behaviors of the nine principals during the study were used to check the validity of the descriptions. Study data resulted in minor changes in the descriptions, but the preliminary descriptions were found to be suprisingly accurate representations of the characteristic actions of the nine principals. However, during the course of the study, one principal originally identified as an Initiator behaved more as a Responder and was so classified in the final data analyses. Thus, for data analysis there were four Responders, three Managers and two Initiators.

The refined descriptions of the three change facilitator styles are as follows:

> Responders place heavy emphasis on allowing teachers and others the opportunity to take the lead. They believe their primary role is to maintain a smooth running school by focusing on traditional administrative tasks, keeping teachers content and treating students

well. Teachers are viewed as strong professionals who are able to carry out their instructional role with little guidance. Responders emphasize the personal side of their relationships with teachers and others. Before they make decisions they often give everyone an opportunity to have input so as to weigh their feelings or to allow others to make the decision. A related characteristic is the tendency toward making decisions in terms of immediate circumstances rather than in terms of longer range instructional or school goals. This seems to be due in part to their desire to please others and in part to their limited vision of how their school and staff should change in the future.

Managers represent a broader range of behaviors. They demonstrate both responsive behaviors in answer to situations or people and they also initiate actions in support of the change effort. The variations in their behavior seem to be linked to their rapport with teachers and central office staff as well as how well they understand and buy into a particular change effort. Managers work without fanfare to provide basic support to facilitate teachers' use of the innovation. They keep teachers informed about decisions and are sensitive to teacher needs. They will defend their teachers from what are perceived as excessive demands. When they learn that the central office wants something to happen in their school they then become very involved with their teachers in making it happen. Yet, they do not typically initiate attempts to move beyond the basics of what is imposed.

Initiators have clear, decisive long-range policies and goals that transcend but include implementation of the current innovation. They tend to have very strong beliefs about what good schools and teaching should be like and work intensely to attain this vision. Decisions are made in relation to their goals for the school and in terms of what they believe to be best for students which is based on current knowledge of classroom practice. Initiators have strong expectations for students, teachers and themselves. They convey and monitor these expectations through frequent contacts with teachers and clear explication of how the school is to operate and how teachers are to teach. When they feel it is in the best interest of their school, particularly the students, Initiators will seek changes in district programs or policies or they will reinterpret them to suit the needs of the school. Initiators will be adamant but not unkind. They solicit input from staff and then decisions are made in terms of the goal of the school even if some are ruffled by their directness and high expectations (Hall and Rutherford, 1983), (Hall, Rutherford, Hord and Huling, 1983).

The reader is reminded that the principals chosen for this study were judged by superordinates to be performing satisfactorily in their present positions. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that all styles that may be found among managers are not represented here. However, since the behavioral descriptions that were used in the initial selection process were based on data collected

from a number of school principals in a variety of districts, it is probable that these three styles are representative of a major portion of school managers.

METHODOLOGY

Subjects of the Study

Although the focus of the study was on principals and what they did to facilitate change in their school, data were also collected from teachers and other key informers within the building. In each school, one and sometimes two, other persons shared the implementation facilitation responsibilities with the principal. The person in each school who had the greatest involvement with the principal in facilitating the particular innovation being studied was termed the second change facilitator and their change related interventions were documented as well (Hord, Hall, Stiegelbauer, 1983).

The Interview Technique

Each school was visited three times during the school year for a period of two to three days and during those visits teachers, principals and second facilitators were interviewed individually. The perceptions of teachers and others about the principal's interventions[1] were documented during these interviews. In addition to the interviews conducted on site, principals and the second change facilitators were interviewed by telephone on a regular basis, typically every two weeks. The purpose of these interviews was to document regularly the interventions that had been made to facilitate implementation of the innovation. They had been furnished with a specially

[1] An intervention is an action or event, or a set of actions or events, that influences use of the innovation (Hall, Zigarmi & Hord, 1979).

designed desk calendar for recording notes or reminders of their activities on a daily basis. It was intended that this be their way of recording interventions between telephone calls. Since this study focused on a specific part of the principal's work, facilitating implementation of a specified curriculum, and only took up a part of their work day, the assumption was made that daily logs and biweekly interviews would allow for recovery of most innovation related activities.

In every interview the information sought was a brief description of the intervention, who made it (source), who was the intervention intended for (target), what was the purpose or function, how was it delivered (medium and flow), and where did it occur (location). All interviews, those on-site and those by telephone, were audio tape recorded so that all data were available verbatim for later analyses. A particular advantage of the interview technique was that it allowed the researchers to probe in depth the reported interventions and to cross check information gained elsewhere. Also, the researcher could question the principal about possible relationships between interventions reported in previous interviews and those presently being reported. Use of the interview technique coupled with the use of questionnaires, observations when on site and the use of multiple informants within and outside the school allowed for triangulation of key interventions and multiple opportunities for any one intervention to be identified. In an earlier pilot study a similar procedure had worked effectively (Griffin, Goldstein and Hall, 1981).

This methodology is unlike the structured observations used in studies that followed the Mintzberg tradition, but for the purposes of this study it was appropriate as well as being necessary. Because the three school

districts in the study were widely separated geographically and because the study ran for an entire school year, it was not feasible to utilize structured observation. It also would not have been efficient since the principals were not expected to devote large parts of each working day to innovation related interventions.

Self Report Data

When relying on self-report data, there are two major problems that face the researcher; 1) Is the information accurate and is it complete? and 2) Does it portray a true picture of what occurred? There can be no sure and certain way to solve these problems, but the interviews with teachers and second facilitators were very useful in monitoring the accuracy and thoroughness of principal data. As one check on thoroughness, at the conclusion of the study a debriefing interview was held with each principal during which they were asked how accurate and complete they believed the information collected from them and their school had been. Regarding accuracy of findings, the response of the principals was generally one of surprise at how much information had been collected and how accurately it portrayed the events of the year. Regarding the completeness of the data, the general response was that had the researchers engaged in more interviews or observations we would have identified a greater number of interventions, but the patterns and nature of their work that were captured in the existing data would not be changed. Following many discussions over the life of the study, the research staff concluded that all critical interventions were identified and that probably 85 to 90 percent of all principal interventions were identified. To identify the final 10% would be infinitely more expensive, and even when full time ethnographers are used some information is missed (Hall, 1980).

DATA ANALYSIS

All identified interventions were coded for analysis by members of the research team who were trained for reliability in identifying, describing and coding interventions. Data were coded using two different schema which had been developed in earlier studies. The Intervention Taxonomy (Hall, Zigarmi & Hord, 1979; Hall & Hord 1982) and the Anatomy of Interventions (Hord, Hall & Zigarmi, 1980). The Intervention Taxonomy presents six levels of interventions that may be thought of as intentional or sponsored actions. These six levels, policy, game plan, game plan components strategy, tactics and incident are distinguished generally by their size and magnitude, meaning the number of individuals targeted and the duration of the action.

Because this report focuses on the tactic and incident level interventions, it will be helpful to have an elaborated definition of these two levels. "A tactic operationalizes strategies and is an interrelated set of small actions intentionally taken to affect attitudes toward or use of the innovation" (Hall and Hord, p. 4). There are two sublevels of tactics, single-complex and chain. Single-complex tactics are a set of different but interrelated incidents that occur once during a relatively short time frame, for example, a week long workshop. Chain tactics are "an ongoing series or repetitions of the same basic incident" (Hall & Hord p. 4), for example systematically visiting each classroom each Friday morning.

The singular occurrence of an action or event that influences innovation implementation is an incident. There are five sublevels of incidents:

Isolated — Is a single action separated in space, time or purpose from other actions.

Simple — Is a single action or interaction that is functionally related to other interventions.

Chain — Is a series of the same simple incidents delivered to different targets.

Repeated — Is a series of the same simple incident delivered to the same target more than once.

Complex — Is a set of related simple actions within a short time frame.

The Anatomy of Interventions permits the analysis and identification of attributes of individual interventions. This analytic tool provides increasingly specific understanding and description of principals' behaviors as they intervene. The schema focuses attention on the internal dimensions of interventions. These dimensions, their definitions and examples follow:

Source — Person(s) who act or events that occur to influence individuals to change. Who are these persons? They might be staff developers, curriculum coordinators, principals, teachers, students, or even events such as snow storms which influence the change effort.

Targets — Person(s) toward whom the intervention is directed. The examples of Targets are the same as Sources except for the addition of the change effort/process as an additional Target. Some interventions are made which have the change process itself as the Target.

Function — The purpose(s) of the intervention. Eight general functions have been identified: (1) Developing supportive or organizational arrangements, (2) Training, (3) Providing consultation and reinforcement, (4) Monitoring and evaluation, (5) External communication, (6) Dissemination, (7) Impeding and (8) Responding to or expressing concerns.

Medium — The mode or form of the action. Such modes might be face-to-face or a form of written communication. Additional possibilities are audiovisual formats, communication by telephone, or the public media such as newspaper, radio, T.V. or journals.

Flow — The direction of the action. The flow of interventions may be one way. There is action directed toward one or more persons who might respond, but there is no interaction. The flow could be interactive, that is, there could be an exchange of actions between the intervenor and the individual(s) being intervened upon.

Location — Where the intervention takes place. Examples would be the setting (campus or school unit building) where teachers or

others are using or learning to use innovations, the central administration building, or training sites.

By using this schema, the various dimensions can be reliably coded to reflect the where, how, why, and target of any intervention.

MEASURES OF PRINCIPAL EFFECTS

Two measures were used to assess the effectiveness of the study principals. One was a measure of the degree to which the innovations under study were implemented in their respective schools and is referred to as the measure of Implementation Success (Huling, Hall, Hord and Rutherford 1983). Implementation Success (IS) is related to use/non-use, appropriate/inappropriate practice and user concerns about the innovation. The basic model is: IS = f (LoU, IC, SoC). LoU is Levels of Use of the Innovation, (Hall, Loucks, Rutherford, Newlove, 1975). IC is Innovation Configurations (Hall and Loucks, 1981) and SoC is Stages of Concern about the innovation (Hall and Rutherford, 1976). Each of these components represent established concepts and measures for considering basic dimensions of implementation as it occurs at the user level.

With these dimensions it is possible to obtain systematic data about each person's use of and concerns about an innovation. Progress can be measured in terms of the implementation of an innovation for each of the three dimensions. When data from each dimension are compared for individuals or groups of staff it is possible to rank order subjects from those who have moved the least or regressed to those who have advanced the most in terms of mastering use of the innovation. The rankings for each of the three dimensions can be combined to give a composite quantitative ranking of implementation success.

To permit a correlation of principal style with implementation success each principal was ranked independently by nine members of the research staff according to the researchers' perceptions of the principal's style. These quantative rankirgs led to a single score for each principal representing the research staff's collective judgements of their style.

A second measure used in the study was developed by the research staff and termed the School Ecology Survey. It was designed to assess the Psychological Climate (PC) in each school. The development of the instrument drew heavily on the work of James and Jones (1974, 1979) and a conceptual framework proposed by James (Hall and Griffin, 1982). This framework is as follows: Psychological Climate = f (Situation, Person, SXP, Reciprocal Interaction). Basically this model suggests that climate has to embrace the individual's perception of the organization and that the overall organizational climate is an aggregate of the indivudals, perceptions. The concept of Psychological Climate (PC) has been proposed to represent the individual's perceptions. The School Ecology Survey, which was completed by every teacher in the study, measured teachers' perceptions of fifteen climate variables grouped under the six categories of Job Characteristics, Leader Characteristics, Workgroup Characteristics, Organizational Characteristics, Decision-Making Characteristics and Student Characteristics. Scores from this survey were correlated with principal style.

STUDY FINDINGS

Before presenting the outcomes of the study, the reader should remember several points. First, the data include those interventions made by the principals to facilitate implementation of a particular curriculum innovation

and so reflect only a portion of the principal's behaviors during the study period. Second, the three styles depicted in this study do not represent the entire range of possible manager styles. Third, in the study sample of nine elementary school principals, four were judged to be Responders, three Managers and two Initiators. (An interesting aside is that several colleagues familiar with school managers have stated that this ratio appears to be representative of the total population of principals.) Finally, although the overall data analyses included five levels of interventions, only incident and tactic level data are presented here. This is because these levels represent the specific day-to-day behaviors, therefore they are most concrete and should be most directly related to effects.

The findings that follow will present the relationships that were found between the style of the study principals and seven work behavior variables, brevity, variety, fragmentation, medium, flow, location. These are all variables commonly considered in studies conducted in the Mintzberg tradition. Relationships between the principal's style and the actions of the second facilitator are also presented because they offer an enriched understanding of the work behavior of the school principals.

Style and the Brevity of Principal Work

Each time a subject principal reported an intervention to the researchers he was asked to indicate how much time the intervention consumed. Admittedly, the times reported were often estimates rather than precise calculations, but the findings confirm those of other studies. Of the 583 incident interventions recorded for the nine principals during the course of the study, most of them required less than five minutes. Principal style did not seem to make a difference as all the principals evidenced this pattern of brevity in their

actions. This finding is consonant with what other researchers have found in the work of managers.

Style and the Variety of Principal Work

The function, or purpose, of principal interventions provides an indication of the variety of principal work and of its focus. The eight function categories used for classifying interventions and the totals by style are shown in Figure 1. Variety in the work of the principals is evident in the fact that they intervened in six of the eight categories (seven counting the .5 in the 6000 category). Although not shown in Figure 1, each of the function categories included several sub-categories of behaviors. For example, under category 2000 Training there were three subcategories of A) teaching new knowledge, skills, B) reviewing and C) clarifying. There was a representative distribution of interventions in each function sub-category which further supports the presence of variety in principal work behavior.

Overall the interventions by function across the styles are much more similar then dissimilar. The greatest discrepancy is in the monitoring and evaluating category where Managers had a markedly higher percentage of interventions (35.7%) than did Responders (22.6%) and Initiators (22.5%). Managers also had fewer interventions (36.2%) for the purpose of developing supportive and organizational arrangements than Responders (45.3%) and Initiators (42.8%). These percentages in this latter category are lower than the 53.7 percent of what Kmetz and Willower (1982) called organizational maintenance tasks in their study of elementary school principals.

No interventions were identified that were designed to impede (7000 category) implementation of the designated innovation. Principals were favorably disposed toward the innovations and these data show what they did to

support the implementation efforts. In addition to providing for support and needed organizational arrangements (1000), these principals intervened most for the purpose of monitoring and evaluating (4000), consulting and reinforcing (3000) and expressing and responding to concerns (8000), in that order. What the principals did very little of in support of the implementation effort was formal training (2000). Training in this case is defined as an organized, scheduled session when one or more persons were instructed or guided in their use of the innovation.

Two functions principals virtually ignored were communicating externally (5000) and disseminating the innovation to others (6000). External communication involves interventions targeted beyond the school, such as parents or district officials, usually to gain support for the innovation or to resolve a problem of some sort. Dissemination interventions are those made for the purpose of encouraging or helping others to use the innovation. Since neither of these purposes is essential to the implementation of the innovation at the school level, it is understandable that the principals would not have intervened for these purposes.

From these data on functions, it can be concluded that the principals in this study intervened for a variety of purposes and the purposes of their interventions did not vary greatly by style.

Style and the Fragmentation of Principal Work

Fragmented and disjointed are adjectives often used along with brevity and variety to describe manager's work. The degree of fragmentation in the work of the study principals is best reflected in the data from incident interventions by sublevels (Figure 2), tactic interventions by sublevels (Figure 3), and principal incidents by target.

Viewing principal incident interventions by sublevels (Figure 2) offers some insights into their relatedness or fragmentation. Isolated incidents represent the most fragmented behavior for by definition these interventions are not linked to other interventions. Simple incidents are casually related to other interventions, although frequently the relationship is vague. The remaining types of interventions, complex, chain and repeated, definitely represent more complex and interrelated actions that are close together in time. Interventions of these three types are more likely to be planned in advance to accomplish a certain purpose while isolated and simple incidents may be more spontaneous.

The most evident findings from these data are that the majority of all interventions for all styles were at the simple sublevel, but the pattern of interventions is quite different according to principal style. When the isolated and simple sublevels are combined the Responder and Manager style principals have 86.8 percent and 83.5 percent, respectively, of all interventions in these two categories. Initiators, on the other hand, have only 61.6 percent of their interventions in these two levels. Proportionally, Initiators made many more interventions of the complex, chain and repeated type than did Managers and Responders.

The Initiator principals with the lower percentage of isolated and simple incidents and greater percentage of complex, chain and repeated incidents would appear to be much less fragmented in their behavior than Managers and Responders. Observations made during on-site visits and contextual information gained during telephone interviews would support this conclusion, Initiator principals were more likely to consider in advance the actions they would take and this they did in relation to their goals for the implementation

effort. There was an overall sense of strategic planning with the intention that each incident would contribute toward the long term objectives.

A summary of the tactic interventions for the nine principals is shown in Figure 3. The total number of tactic interventions for the three groups is quite similar, but beyond that the differences are marked. On the average Initiators had 120 percent more tactic interventions than Responders and approximately 50 percent more than Managers. Additionally, when incident and tactic interventions are combined, tactics represent 24.2 percent of the total for Initiators as compared with 16.4 percent for Responders and 15.4 percent for Managers. Viewed in another way, the tactic interventions of Initiators were 48 to 57 percent greater than for Managers and Responders, respectively. The greater use of tactic interventions by Initiators is further evidence that there was less fragmentation and more intentionality and complexity in their pattern of intervening than in the behavior of Managers and Responders.

Further support for this interpretation can be found in the sublevels for tactic interventions. In the sublevels, chain tactics are more involved and require more advance planning than single-complex tactics. As revealed in Figure 3, 75 percent of the Initiators' tactics were chains, a percentage much higher than that of Responders (48.3%) and Managers (57.1%).

Much attention has been given to the difference between Initiators and the other two groups, but the difference between Responders and Managers should also be noted. Managers averaged 14.7 tactics while Responders had an average of 10; 57.1 percent of the Manager tactics were of the chain type compared to 48.3 percent for Responders. These figures suggest that Responders in this study were less likely to have continuity in their intervention behaviors than either Managers or Initiators.

There are two findings from the data on intervention targets that are relevant to the fragmentation of principal work. Initiators used other personnel in the school (including the second facilitator) assistant facilitators to a much greater extent than did the other principals. For example, 20.7 percent of the Initiator interventions were directed at one or more persons within the school who were assisting with the implementation of the particular innovation as compared with 8.7 percent for Managers and 4.9 percent for Responderers. Not only did Initiators engage others more in the implementation effort, they relied primarily on persons within their own school. Managers also did this to a considerable degree. Responders, relied more on persons outside the school.

Responders frequently intervened by responding to individual teacher requests or problems. Initiators were more likely to anticipate needed actions and to execute them in a planned manner, often through the use of others. Evidence of this pattern of intervening is seen in the fact that 47.1 percent of the Responder interventions were directed at individual teachers while 34 percent of Initiator interventions were targeted to individual teachers. Managers targeted individual teachers 41 percent of the time.

Intervening on individuals could have the advantage of clarifying communication within the organization and building better relationships between leader and followers. However, the disadvantage is that it divides the manager's time into many more segments than would interventions targeted at groups or at a resource person who would reach multiple others. The way in which Initiators targeted their interventions seems to account in part for the sense of assurance and control they projected relative to their work and to the relatedness of their interventions to their long term objectives

In summary, the above data indicates that the work behavior of Initiators is not as fragmented as the behavior of Managers and Responders.

Style and the Medium, Flow and Location of Principal Work

For each intervention recorded data were collected to reflect the medium used in making the intervention, the flow of the action, and the location where the intervention occurred. How these aspects of the principal's work relates to style is discussed below.

Medium -- Mintzberg (1973) and others (Martin & Willower 1981, Willis, 1980 and Duignan 1980) found that managers spend more than half of their working day in some type of verbal contact. Therefore, it was no surprise to find that for the principals in this study most of the recorded incident interventions involved verbal contact. Variation between styles was minimal with the combined total of face-to-face and telephone interventions ranging from 84.6 to 90.6 percent of the total incident interventions.

Flow -- when the flow of the incident interventions is considered, in excess of one-fourth of them were one-way. A one-way flow reflects the manager telling a person or group something and not receiving (or allowing) a return comment. This finding was surprising for it was assumed that most manager telling a person or group something and not receiving (or allowing) a return comment. This finding was surprising for it was assumed that most verbal interventions would be interactive, in the nature of a conversation. Since the medium for up to 13 percent of the interventions was written, this would account for some of the one-way flow, but for less than half.

One-way interventions were typically brief in terms of time and as such they would reinforce the brevity and fragmentation characterizations of managers' work. But it should be noted that brief, one-way verbal interac-

tions can be a very efficient way of discharging managerial responsibilities and may be a way to keep the work from becoming hectic and frenzied.

Initiators had more one-way interactions (40.6%) than Managers (38.6%) or Responders (30.9%). This is consonant with their decisive, "in-charge" pattern of behavior and may contribute the sense of control they seemed to have over their work.

Location -- Willis (1980) found that the education managers in his study spent 55.8 percent of their time and conducted 73.6 percent of their activities in their office. Only 2.2 percent of their time was spent in classrooms with 29.4 percent spent elsewhere in the building. Unlike Willis' managers, these principals intervened more outside the office than in the office. Approximately 42 percent of the Manager interventions were made in the office and that percent decreased to 30 and 24 for Responders and Initiators, respectively. As with Willis' managers, the study principals were in classrooms less than in their office or elsewhere in the school. Fewer than 15 percent of the interventions occurred in classrooms.

Out of these data on medium flow and location, the major differences between styles that emerge are: (1) Initiators had more one-way interactions than the other principals, (2) Managers intervened in their office more than the other principals and (3) Initiators intervened in their office less than the other principals.

Use of Second Facilitators

During the course of the study, the same intervention data were collected on that person identified as second change facilitator as were collected on the principals. From both the principal and second change facilitator, qualitative data were collected during the interviews that reflected on their

relationships with each other as change facilitators. It was apparent from these data that the relationships between the principals and second facilitators differed according to the style of the principal. Initiator principals delegated responsibilities to the second facilitator in a planned, purposeful ways and then followed-up with the second facilitator to determine progress and outcomes. Rather than receiving carefully delegated responsibilities second facilitators to Responder principals often performed tasks that needed to be done and that they felt they should do. In schools with Responder principals expediency rather than planned delegation by the principal seemed to be the impetus for many of the interventions made by these second facilitators. In fact, the second change facilitators in Responder schools targeted the principal significantly more often than was the case for the other two styles. Often these interventions were to get some kind of decision or action from the principal. Managers made more interventions themselves and their second facilitators fewer than the other two groups when they did delegate, Managers were more intentional than Responders but less systematic than Initiatiors.

SITUATIONAL VARIABLES AND MANAGER WORK

Earlier in this paper it was noted that Mintzberg (1973) stated that little is known about the influence of style. He also gave considerable attention to the influence of the situation on manager work behavior. So far, this report has focused on behaviors of style, but what about situational influences? Considerable data were collected that reflect on the relationship between situational variables and the work of the study principals.

A number of writers have advanced categories or dimensions of context that influence manager work. Leithwood and Montgomery (1982a) classify

obstacles to principals' work into five categories: (1) school board, (2) the principal's role, (3) the role incumbent himself, (4) teachers and, (5) the community. Some years earlier (Campbell and Gregg, 1957) identified the community and board as important contextual variables. Campbell also included in his categories the school organization and the organized profession. Griffiths' Tridimensional concept (1956) proposed the three situational categories of the job, the man and the social setting. Others emphasize leader control (Fiedler, 1978) and task demands (House, 1971) as key influencing variables.

Contextual data in this study included information from most of these identified categories with additional information from other areas. Data were collected through interviews, observations, survey instruments, and by monitoring printed communication documents such as internal memos, district newsletters and through subscriptions to the local newspapers. At the organizational level, attention was directed to the school organization, the district level organization and to state level influences (e.g. state assessment tests) on the innovation implementation effort. Information about the immediate school community as well as the community at large was collected. Most intensive consideration was given to the job (principal's role), the person (role incumbent), the teachers and the school as an organization. From these data several propositions have been developed regarding work of the study principals.

Before presenting these propositions, it is useful to review current thinking about the situation and manager's work. In the literature there seems to be a prevailing belief that due to the effects of the situation there is no one best leader style. Yet, the acceptance and interpretation of that position varies among theorists. At one end of the continuum is the position

taken by Blake and Mouton (1964, 1982) that there is one best style (9+9) for all situations. Representing the more traditional position would be the theory of Situational Leadership (Hersey & Blanchard, 1977) that maintains that leader style can and should change according to the situation. Standing somewhere in between these positions is Fiedler and the contingency theory. Fiedler (1978) acknowledges the impact of the situation on the leader, but believes that it is unlikely that leaders can or will change style to match changing situations. Instead, he believes that it is much more likely and logical to expect the leader to change the situation to match his style. The propositions that follow reveal the findings from this study that reflect on the relationship between the situation and the work of the principals.

Propositions about Situational Influences

1. Principals will modify their behaviors in response to changing situations, but their style is likely to remain constant. This position is premised on a definition of style that is more than the overt behaviors of the manager. "Style is the gestalt of knowledge, concerns, behaviors and tone as reflected in the motivations and interventions of the manager" (Rutherford, Hord, Huling & Hall, 1983, p. 119). As defined here, behaviors are varied, reasonably flexible and changeable but style is much more stable.

This fact was vividly demonstrated by the three principals in one of the districts studied. In this district, the innovation required that principals regularly monitor and evaluate teacher's use of the innovation. As a result of this district-wide requirement, the three principals, on the average, intervened twice as much for the purpose of monitoring and evaluation as did the other six principals in the study. The implementation requirement obviously increased the monitoring and evaluating behaviors of these

principals, but it did not result in a change in their overall style. These principals were either Responders or Managers and they monitored in characteristic ways of the Responder or Manager style.

2. Although managers may change behaviors in response to particular situations, these changes do not alter the basic characterstics of their work behavior. Studies following the Mintzberg tradition have been fairly consistent in their findings regarding the variety, brevity, fragmentation, medium and location of manager work behavior. During the course of the study there was no evidence that the principals made changes in these basic characteristics of their work behavior even though they did change behavior in terms of functions and targets. This finding was consistent across styles.

3. Changes in behaviors are more likely to occur within a range rather than extending the range of manager behaviors. For example, one principal was very active in facilitating an innovation in his school besides the one being studied. Although the pattern of interventions according to functions appeared to vary considerably between the two implementation efforts the difference was a matter of more or less rather than his using entirely different behaviors. There were some function categories not pursued with either innovation. This pattern of within style consistency was also observed with other principals in the study.

4. The degree to which a principal will attempt to change the situation to match his style is dependent on the principal's style. Initiators will definitely attempt to modify the context if they feel it is needed, up to and including influencing policy changes at the district level. Managers will also attempt to bring about situational changes but not so aggressively and usually only within the scope of their school. Responders, however, will frequently act as if new situations are not really new or different, thus

maintaining their pattern of behaviors. If they do attempt to change the situation their efforts tend to be minimal.

5. Teacher concerns about the innovation did not influence the behaviors of principals as much as their overall style. House (1971) formulated a number of hypotheses regarding the ideal relationship between the routineness and satisfaction level of tasks (for subordinates) and leader behaviors such as initiating structure, closeness of supervision, hierarchial influence, authoritarianism and leader consideration. To be maximally effective according to House as subordinate feelings or concerns about the task change, the behaviors of managers should change in predictable ways. Among the principals in this study, this was only partially true.

During the school year, concerns of teachers about using the innovation being studied were assessed four times using the Stages of Concern Questionnaire (Hall, George, Rutherford, 1977). These data were analyzed by the research team and given back to the principals in a manner that allowed them to identify the concerns of each teacher in their building by name. From these data principals could readily determine how their teachers were feeling about the demands of the innovation. The reason for giving the principals these data was to study how they would use the data in planning their interventions. How did the principals respond to the information?

Responders paid little or no attention to the information. When asked, they sometimes did not even recall having received the data. When individual teachers expressed their concerns face-to-face Responder style principals would respond to the immediate symptom, but did not give systematic consideration to the larger concern. Initiators gave much more attention to the concerns data and even used it in planning significant interventions with teachers. Managers tended to scan the data for general impressions and in a

few instances based interventions on the data. Apart from the feedback provided by the researchers, it was noted that Initiators and Managers, Initiators in particular, were much more likely than Responders to be aware of teacher concerns generated by the innovation and to respond to them in a planned way.

6. Changing style in response to the situation is neither logical nor feasible in most instances. This does not mean that it is never appropriate to change style, only that it is not as easy, logical, or wise as some theorists have suggested. Consider for a moment the theory of situational leadership as proposed by Hersey and Blanchard (1977). According to this theory the manager will modify his style on the basis of follower maturity. This suggests that all followers within a group will be at the same maturity level. Data from this and our other studies do not support that assumption. The following situation illustrates this.

As mentioned above, Stages of Concern data were collected periodically throughout the study from the teachers in the nine schools. These data revealed teachers' concerns about the innovation. Additionally, two other kinds of data were collected periodically from teachers and these focused not on teachers' feelings, but their actual use of the innovation. Levels of Use data (Hall, Loucks, Rutherford, & Newlove, 1975) revealed the progress teachers were making in their use of the innovation. Innovation Configuration data (Heck, Stiegelbauer, Hall, Loucks, 1981) indicated to what extent teachers were using the innovation as it was intended. Collectively, these data on individual teachers depicted their "maturity" in the use of the innovation. There were wide variations among teachers within any school. Furthermore, years of experience with the innovation did not eliminate within-school variations. Variations among teachers in schools in the third

year of implementation were as great as among teachers in the first year of implementation.

Given these variations in teacher's overall maturity in relation to the innovation there would seem to be no way that principals could change their style to suit the multiple maturity levels. Also to be considered is the fact that individual teacher maturity may well differ from one innovation to another so that the teacher who might be involved with two innovations (which is common in schools) could have two maturity levels. This would further complicate style selection based on follower maturity.

For purposes of example follower maturity has been used as one situational variable, but it is likely that other situational variables are sufficiently inconsistent and unpredictable to make it difficult, if not unwise, for a manager to change style in response to those variables. Changing style to adjust to situational variables assumes leaders have the potential to readily shift styles and propositions 1-3 maintain this is unlikely.

7. Situational variables are more likely to influence the focus of manager behavior than the basic nature of their work. As the situation in a school changed, the principals would attend to the new situation, but typically with their same overall pattern of behavior. As an example, one principal (an Initiator) in the second year of implementation noted that his teachers were having much difficulty with some management aspects of the innovation. After careful study, the principal shifted a classroom teacher to a full-time assignment as consultant/assistant to the other teachers.

The problem the principal identified in teacher use of the innovation was a significant one, but it could have been easily ignored or it might have prompted some emergency actions such as calling in district level consultants

to provide immediate inservice training. Instead, the principal followed his typical pattern of managerial behavior which was to carefully consider the problem, take decisive action and delegate responsibility using resources within the school rather than going outside.

Although an example of an Initiator principal is used here, data revealed that all principals regardless of style, tended to shift their managerial focus as new situations evolved, but their overall pattern of reactions was rather consistent.

8. The commonly held belief that there is no one best style because the situation will determine what is best is only a half-truth if true at all. Proposition 1 pointed out that in response to a changing situation the manager may modify his behaviors, but is not likely to change his style. From this study much evidence was derived that revealed that the principals did not change style in response to the situation. As further support of this proposition, consider the following.

Use of the innovation studied in each district was mandated, by the central office. Furthermore, the innovations were designed to be used in certain ways. Yet, the principals within each district gave their individual interpretations to what was expected of them and their faculty. As a result, teachers attended to implementation in different ways and there was considerable variation in what the principals accepted as "acceptable" use of the innovation. A district mandate to implement a major curriculum innovation in a particular way would seem to represent a powerful situational variable. Certainly it had a significant influence on the teachers in the buildings as reflected in their Stages of Concern, Levels of Use and Innovation Configuration data. Still, each principal facilitated implementation effort in their school in their "old familiar style".

The contention that there is no best style implies there are a variety of styles managers may exhibit, each being most suitable to a particular situation. Findings from this study plus the findings from many other studies (Bennis, 1983; Peters, 1980; Leithwood and Montgomery, 1982b; Cotton and Savard, 1980; Persell and Cookson, 1982) would not support that position, or at least not completely.

The ultimate intention of most, if not all, organizations is to progress and to improve, however that may be defined within the organization. There may be intermediate objectives such as subordinate satisfaction or positive public image, but these are usually contributory, not primary objectives. Given the primary objectives of progress and improvement, this and other studies from education and business have identified one characteristic style that is more effective for the attainment of these objectives. This style is characterized by the leader who has clear and definite goals for the organization, who pursues those goals with persistence and consistency, who communicates those goals clearly and who supports them through personal interactions with organizational members.

As situational variables change, managers may need to adjust some behaviors, but the effectiveness of the style described above remains constant. This fact coupled with the limited influence the situation has on manager style calls into question the validity of the assumption that the situation determines what style is best.

9. Some styles are not best in any situation. This proposition is a corollary of the previous one. The emphasis in the literature and research on the situational determination of best style might easily lead to the conclusion that every style would have one or more situations where it would be best. Findings from this study suggest this is not true.

Earlier in this paper two factors used to assess principal effectiveness were described. These were Implementation Success and the psychological climate of a school. Findings from measures of these variables address the issue of best style.

When the scores for Implementation Success were correlated with scores reflecting staff researchers' perceptions of principal style, a significant relationship was found (.74). In the schools where the principals were perceived to be most like Initiators, there was greater implementation success. In schools where principals were perceived to be most like Responders, there was the least degree of implementation success (Huling & Hall, 1983).

On the School Ecology Survey there were fifteen variables representing six categories. Correlations between scores on the survey and principal change facilitating style varied from variable to variable but there was a definite pattern to the findings. Scores were higher (reflecting a more favorable psychological climate) in schools with Manager style principals and lower in schools with Responder type principals.

On both measures of principal effectiveness used in this study, the principal who had a Responder style of facilitating change performed less well than Initiator or Manager style principals. In an earlier study Responder style principals were also associated with dissatisfied teachers in terms of their Stages of Concern profiles (Hall, Hord & Griffin, 1980).

Another way of assessing effectiveness was possible by using the data on principal interventions. Those data revealed that Responders relied on district personnel more to assist in the implementation effort in their school than did Initiators and Managers. Initiators and Managers were more likely to use resources internal to the school to support the implementation effort. In

Responder schools more district level resources were required to support the principal and to maintain the implementation effort at a successful level. Because the Responder principals were less effective in utilizing resources available to them, the implementation effort cost the district more in personnel resources. At the same time, the total number of interventions was least in Responder led schools, which suggests less implementation support.

Remembering that at the outset all principals chosen were judged by their subordinates to be performing in an acceptable manner, it should not be inferred that Responders were poor principals. The proposition is that Responders are not likely to perform as change facilitators as well as Managers or Initiators in any situation typically found in schools. The point has been pursued here to challenge some contemporary leadership theories rather than to disparge particular principal styles.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

From his classic study of the work behavior of managers, Mintzberg (1973) established a description that remains generally undisputed. He discovered that the work of managers is marked by variety, brevity and fragmentation. However, he acknowledged that his work did not consider the influence of personal style on work behavior. This paper reports on the influence of style and situational variables on the work of nine schools principals who were studied for one school year as they facilitated the implementation of a curriculum innovation in their school. Unlike most studies of manager work, interviews, principal logs and debriefing were used rather than structured observation as the primary data collection techniques.

Findings from this study revealed that style had more influence on manager work behavior than did situational variables. Three distinct styles

were established and each of the nine study principals was classified as having one of those styles. The three styles, Responder, Manager and Initiator, are described in detail. Variety and brevity were common in the behavior of all principals regardless of style, but fragmentation of behavior varied according to style. Initiators were very goal oriented and consistent in pursuit of those goals and as a result their behaviors tended to be related one to the other and to be focused toward accomplishing a particular goal. True, these behaviors were usually short in duration and served a variety of purposes, but they were definitely aligned. Thus, the work of Initiator principals did not seem to have the type of fragmentation that Mintzberg and others have identified in manager work behavior.

Responder principals on the other hand were not particularly goal oriented. Instead, they viewed their teachers as autonomous professionals and their role as one of providing support as teachers requested or needed it. As a result, there was less continuity across their behaviors leaving the impression that they were fragmented. Behaviors of Manager principals fell in between those of Initiators and Responder.

There are several plausible explanations why, unlike all previous studies of manager work, some principals in this present study did not appear to behave in a fragmented manner. First, the research methodology used was repeated interviews instead of structured observation. This allowed the researchers to probe the thinking and reasoning of the principals and to recognize relationships between and among behaviors that might not be evident through structured observation. A second explanation is that principals with certain styles do actually differ in their work behavior. In this study, principals were selected as being representative of particular styles and

therefore the study included a range of behavioral patterns. Perhaps a much more limited range of leaders were sampled in the earlier studies.

In summary, there are four key conclusions to be drawn from this study.

1. The characteristics of manager work behavior identified in previous research by Mintzberg and others have been confirmed, but the nature and degree of this behavior is clearly influenced by the manager's style.

2. Style is a powerful factor to be considered when studying the work of managers. Not only does style influence the characteristics of manager work behavior, it has greater influence on manager behavior than situational variables.

3. It is possible to identify distinct manager styles.

4. Style is very stable and does not easily or quickly change. Behaviors of a manager do vary but his basic style remains quite constant.

As a next step in this line of research it would be useful to determine if the styles and propositions derived from this study of school managers hold true for managers in other fields of work.

Figure 1

Principal Incidents by Function (In Percentages)

Functions	Responders	Managers	Initiators
1000. Dev. Supp./Org. Arrangements	45.3	36.2	42.8
2000. Training	2.5	.9	4.3
3000. Consultation & Reinforcement	16.7	15.5	14.5
4000. Monitoring & Evaluating	22.6	35.7	22.5
5000. Communicating Externally	1.5	2.9	4.3
6000. Disseminating	.5	0	0
7000. Impeding Use	0	0	0
8000. Expressing/Resp. to Concerns	10.4	8.8	11.6

Figure 2

Principal Incidents by Sublevels (In Percentages)

	Responders N = 4	Managers N = 3	Initiators N = 2	Frequency
Isolated	3.4	1.7	0	11
Simple	83.4	81.8	61.6	452
Complex	3.4	9.5	21.7	60
Chain	7.8	5.0	10.9	43
Repeated	2.0	2.0	5.1	16
Total number of incident interventions	204.0	241.0	138.0	583
Average number of incident interventions	51	80.3	69	

*one Initiator intervention was not codeable

Figure 3

Principal Tactics by Sublevels (In Percentages)

Sublevels	Responders N = 4	Managers N = 3	Initiators N = 2	Frequency
Single Complex	51.7	42.9	34.2	49
Chain	48.3	57.1	74.8	79
Blank (Specify)	0	0	0	
Total number of tactic interventions	40	44	44	128
Average number of tactic interventions	10	14.7	22	

REFERENCES

Bennis, Warren
1983 "Effective leadership the exception, not the rule." U.S. News and World Report, Inc., April, 25:64.

Blake, R. R. and J. S. Mouton
1964 The managerial grid. Houston: Gulf Publishing Co.

Blake, R. R. and J. S. Mouton
1982 "Theory and research for developing a science of leadership." The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 18:275-291.

Campbell, Roald F. and T. Gregg (eds.)
1957 Administrative behavior in education. Sponsored by the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Cotton, K. and W. G. Savard
1980 "The principal as instructional leader." Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Duignan, Patrick
1980 "Administration behavior of school superintendents: A descriptive study." The Journal of Educational Administration, 18(1), 5-26.

Fiedler, F. E.
1978 "The contingency model and the dynamics of the leadership process." In Berkowitz, L. (ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology: 59-112. New York: Academic Press.

Griffin, T., M. Goldstein and G. E. Hall
1981 "A pilot test of methods for documenting principal interventions." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Dallas.

Griffiths, Daniel E.
1956 Human relations in school administration. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.

Gronn, Peter C.
1983 "Talk as the work: The accomplishment of school administration." Administrative Science Quarterly, 28:1-21.

Hall, G. E.
1980 "Evaluation of the delivery of services: A concerns-based perspective for the design of evaluations." Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas.

Hall, G. E., A. A. George and W. L. Rutherford
1977 "Measuring stages of concern about the innovation: A manual for use of the SoC questionnaire." Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas.

Hall, G. E. and T. H. Griffin
1982 "Analysis of the context/climate in school settings - which is which? Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas.

Hall, G. E. and S. M. Hord
1982 "A framework for analyzing what change facilitators do: The intervention taxonomy." Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas.

Hall, G. E., S. M. Hord and T. H. Griffin
1980 "Implementation at the school building level: The development and analysis of nine minicase studies." Paper presented at the American Education Research Association, Boston.

Hall, G. E. and S. L. Loucks
1981 "Program definition and adaptation: Implications for inservice." Journal of Research and Development in Education, 14(2), 46-58.

Hall, G. E., S. F. Loucks, W. L. Rutherford and B. W. Newlove
1975 "Levels of use of the innovation: A framework for analyzing innovation adoption." The Journal of Teacher Education, 29(1), 52-56.

Hall, G. E. and W. L. Rutherford
1976 "Concerns of teachers about implementing team teaching." Educational Leadership, 34(3):227-233.

Hall, G. E. and W. L. Rutherford
1983 "Three change facilitator styles: How principals affect improvement efforts. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas.

Hall, G. E., W. L. Rutherford, S. M. Hord and L. L. Huling
1983 "The principal as facilitator of school improvement: Findings from recent research." Educational Leadership, in press.

Hall, G. E. P. Zigarmi and S. M. Hord
1979 "A taxonomy of interventions: The prototype and initial testing." Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas.

Heck, S., S. M. Stiegelbauer, G. E. Hall and S. F. Loucks
1981 "Measuring innovation configurations: Procedures and applications. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas.

Hersey, P. and K. H. Blanchard
1977 Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing Human Resources (3rd edition). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hord, S. M.
1981 "Analyzing administrator intervention behaviors." Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas.

Hord, S. M., G. E. Hall and S. M. Stiegelbauer
1983 "The role of the consigliere." Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas.

Hord, S. M., G. E. Hall and P. Zigarmi
1980 "Anatomy of incident and tactic interventions: Dimensions, Design." Paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, Boston.

House, R. J.
1971 "A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness." Administrative Science Quarterly, 16:321-338.

Huling, L. L., G. E. Hall, S. M. Hord and W. L. Rutherford
1983 "A multi-dimensional approach for assessing implementation success." Austin: The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas.

James, L. R. and A. P. Jones
1974 "Organizational climate: A review of theory and research. Psychological Bulletin, 81(12):1096-1112.

Jones, A. P. and L. R. James
1979 "Psychological climate: Dimensions and relationships of individuals and aggregated work environment perceptions." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 23:201-250.

Kmetz, John T. and Donald J. Willower
1982 "Elementary school principals' work behavior." Educational Administration Quarterly, 18(4):61-78.

Leithwood, K. A. and D. J. Montgomery
1982a "Obstacles preventing principals from becoming more effective.: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.

Leithwood, K. A. and D. J. Montgomery
1982b "The role of the elementary school principal in program improvement." Review of Educational Research, 52(3):309-339.

Martin, William J. and Donald J. Willower
1981 "The managerial behavior of high school principal." Educational Administration Quarterly, 17(1):69-90.

Melle, M. and H. Pratt
1981 "Documenting program adaptation in a district-wide implementation effort: The three-year evolution from evaluation to an instructional improvement plan." Austin: The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas.

Mintzberg, Henry
1973 The Nature of Managerial Work. New York: Harper and Row.

Persell, C. H. and P. W. Cookson, Jr.
1982 "The effective principal in action." In The Effective Principal; A Research Summary: 22-29. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Peters, J.
1980 "A style for all seasons." Executive, 12-16.

Rutherford, W. L.
1981 "The intervention and plans principals make when facilitating change." Paper presented at the Southwest Educational Research Association, Dallas.

Rutherford, W. L., S. M. Hord, L. L. Huling and G. E. Hall
1983 "Change facilitators: In search of understanding their role." Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas.

Sproull, Lee S.
1981 "Managing education programs: A micro-behavioral analysis." Human Organization, 40(2):113-122.

Thomas A. Ross, Quentin Willis and David Phillips
1981 "Observational studies of Australian school administrators: Methodological issues." The Australian Journal of Education, 25(1):55-72.

Willis, Quentin
1980 "The work activity of school principals: An observational study." The Journal of Educational Administration, 18(1):27-54.